

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUL 06 2009

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

BY **DAVID J. MALAND, CLERK**
DEPUTY *shd*

LASERDYNAMICS, INC.,
Plaintiff,

vs.

QUANTA COMPUTER, INC.,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NO. 2:06-CV-348

VERDICT FORM

QUESTION NO. 1:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Quanta Computer, Inc. ("QCI") contributed to or induced infringement of claim 3 of the '981 patent?

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each listed product below:

SBW243: Yes Yes

SDW087: Yes Yes

SBW242: Yes Yes

SDR089: Yes Yes

SBW245: Yes Yes

UBW241: Yes Yes

SDR083: Yes Yes

SDW088: Yes Yes

SBW246: Yes Yes

SDW041: Yes Yes

SDW085: Yes Yes

SDW042: Yes Yes

SDR08B: Yes Yes

SDW082: Yes Yes

SDW086: Yes Yes

SDR08C: Yes Yes

QUESTION NO. 2:

Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that claim 3 of the '981 patent is invalid because it is not enabled?

Answer "Yes" or "No".

No No

If you answered “**Yes**” to any accused product on Question 1 AND you answered “**No**” to Question 2 above, then answer the following Questions 3 and 4.

Otherwise, **DO NOT** answer the following Questions. The jury foreperson should instead sign and date the Verdict Form and **return** it to the Court Security Officer.

QUESTION NO. 3:

Do you find by a clear and convincing evidence that Quanta Computer, Inc.’s infringement, contributorily or by inducement, of claim 3 of the ‘981 patent was willful?

Answer “Yes” or “No”:

Yes *Yes*

QUESTION NO. 4:

What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, would fairly and reasonably compensate LaserDynamics as a reasonable royalty for infringement that you have found?

Answer in dollars and cents, if any, for a reasonable royalty:

Answer:

~~\$52,000,000~~ R 7/6/09

\$52,000,000

Signed this 6 day of July, 2009.

JURY FOREPERSON